DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 064 SP 006 298

AUTHOR	Goldbas, Mervyn; And Others
TITLE	Teacher Performance: Do We Know What We are Evaluating?
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Fredonia. Teacher Education Research Center.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Records; Confidential Records; Elementary Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Performance Criteria; *Student Evaluation; *Student Teachers; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*Distinguished Achievement Award Entry

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to provide the teacher trainers at State University College, Fredonia, New York with information to identify the actual criteria upon which student teachers were being evaluated and to provide a basis for altering the evaluation process so that it would measure more validly the degree to which objectives of the field experience program were attained. A random sampling of Student Teaching Evaluation Forms of elementary education graduates was analyzed in terms of their relationship to marks, recommendations, and job success. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to indicate the strength of association between the evaluative criteria of instructional traits, human relationships, classroom management, and personal traits to the variables of grades, recommendations, and job success. Results showed that the Student Teaching Evaluation Forms had little external or internal validity. (A copy of the form is included.) (BRB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 074064

TEACHER PERFORMANCE:

DO WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE EVALUATING?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mervyn Goldbas and Daniel Wheeler

Department of Education

SUC, Fredonia, New York

and

Ronald E. Hull and Daniel Bauman

Teacher Education Research Center

SUC, Fredonia, New York

SP 006 398

FOREWORD

This study, Teacher Performance: Do We Know What We Are Evaluating?, was conducted primarily to provide feedback to SUC, Fredonia professional staff and cooperating schools concerning procedures for evaluating student teachers. The findings contained in this document may prove useful to those who wish to consider changes in the current student teacher evaluation process.

The study was conducted by the Teacher Education Research Center and the Office of Field Experiences, Department of Education at SUC, Fredonia. The study is another inquiry into the problems and practices of induction of beginning teachers.

The authors wish to express their sincere thanks to members of the Teacher Education Research Center staff, Office of Field Experiences staff, and the staff of the Placement Office, SUC, Fredonia, for their cooperation and support in data collection. Special thanks is due Marian Anderson for assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

Kenneth G. Nelson, Director
Teacher Education Research Center

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword	i
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Problem	2
Methodology	3
Definitions of Variables	4
Question One	5
Question Two	6
Question Three	9
Question Four	9
Question Five	10
Conclusions and Implications	11
Bibliography	14
Appendix A - Student Teachers' Evaluation Form	15
Appendix B - Tables	19
Appendix C - Recommendation Form	26

Introduction

One of the most promising and profound innovative developments in education in the seventies is the movement toward performance-based teacher education. It promises to revolutionize teacher education by replacing traditional training programs with specified performance standards which will be open to anyone, regardless of background, who can meet the established performance criteria.

Innovations of this magnitude usually generate many problems and unanswered questions. Salient among the obstacles to be overcome is the problem of establishing valid criteria for evaluating teacher performance and the measurement of those criteria. It has been asserted that:

> Pupil learning is the appropriate criterion for assessing the effectiveness of teacher trainers and training programs; but until relationships between teacher behavior and pupil learning can be more firmly established through research and improved measurement, judgments will have to be made on a priori grounds.[1]

Presently, it is assumed that desirable teacher behaviors, e. g., skill in questioning, facilitate pupil learning. But, to what extent are teachers being evaluated on the performance of such competencies? Once this basis has been established, plans can be developed for moving toward a program of teacher education which emphasizes performance criteria as prime indicators of teaching competence.

---

1 Stanley Elam, "Performance-based Teacher Education," AACTE Bulletin, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, Number 9, (Washington, D. C. 20036, December, 1971), p. 6.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to provide the teacher trainers at SUC, Fredonia, New York, with information which will: (1) help them more clearly identify the actual criteria upon which student teachers are presently being evaluated; and (2) provide a basis for altering the evaluation process so that it may measure more validly the degree to which objectives of the field experiences program are attained. This study is intended to provide some base-line data which may support the movement toward a performance-based teacher training program.

Problem

Theoretically, student teaching evaluations should function to determine the degree to which neophyte teachers are capable of assuming classroom responsibilities in schools. However, some beginning teachers secure jobs in schools and function "successfully" regardless of their student teaching marks and/or recommendations of college supervisors and cooperating teachers. Some successful beginning teachers stated that they had never had "student teaching."[2]

Possibly the evaluations of student teachers do not truly reflect the degree to which they are capable of assuming classroom responsibilities. Furthermore, it is possible that student

---

[2]John B. Bouchard and Ronald E. Hull, Problems and Practices in the Induction of Beginning Teachers, Teacher Education Research Center Report (SUC, Fredonia, New York, 1970).

teachers are evaluated on criteria other than those which appear on the standard Student Teaching Evaluation Forms. Or, their evaluations may be disproportionately weighted on some criteria while others of equal importance are practically overlooked.

In this study, student teachers' evaluation data were analyzed in terms of their relationship to marks, recommendations and job success. The general objectives were:

1. To study the relationship of the criteria used in evaluating student teachers to success, defined as (a) student teaching grades, (b) recommendations by the supervisor, and (c) getting a teaching position subsequent to graduation.

2. To provide a data based upon which an improved student teacher evaluation procedure may be developed.

3. To provide feedback to Junior Professional Sequence staff, Office of Field Experience staff, Co-operating schools, Placement staff and pre-service education students concerning induction expectations.

Methodology

Sixty and seventy evaluation forms were randomly sampled from respective populations of 213 and 273 elementary education majors who graduated in 1970 and 1971 at SUC, Fredonia, New York. The evaluation data were taken from the standard Student Teaching Evaluation Form (See Appendix A). Data on recommendations were obtained by examining written statements (See Appendix C) which were classified into four categories: (1) Highly Recommended; (2) Recommended, (3) Recommended with Reservation and (4) Not Recommended. The terminology used by the supervisors in their

written statements were such that the statements clearly fell into each of the four categories. Independent analysis by the two raters resulted in perfect inter-rater reliability. Grades were obtained from the records of the Office of Field Experiences; data on job success were obtained from the Placement Office, SUC, Fredonia.

The Pearson's Product Moment Correlation* was used to indicate the strength of association between evaluative criteria and variables such as: grades, recommendations and job success.

Definitions of Variables

Success

A. Job Success. Job success was determined by whether or not student teachers were hired in teaching positions the fall following graduation.

B. Grades. Grades were assigned student teachers on the basis of A, B, or C. In a few cases, pass-fail marks were selected by the student teachers.

---

*To avoid the problem of attenuation of the correlation coefficient contingency Table 7 was prepared. When restriction of range is severe, as it is when the only grades used are "A" and "B", attenuation of the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation coefficient is a factor to be considered. If the full grade range were used, the correlation coefficients might be higher. Since the full range is not used in actual practice, there seems little value in pursuing an alternate course that never occurs. The fact is that grades are poor predictors of other criteria of success. There is little value in pursuing probable causes of the low predictive validity that will not be changed such as low interrater reliability. Correction coefficients will be reported in the interest of parsimony.

C. Recommendations. Recommendations were assigned on the basis of Highly Recommended, Recommended, Recommended with Reservation, or Not Recommended.

Placement

Placement was determined by whether or not the student teachers obtained a job in the district where they did their student teaching.

Approach

Approach is defined as the Building Approach or an approach where student teachers were assigned to one co-operating teacher for each 1/2 semester of their field experiences.

Criteria

Definitions of the evaluative criteria are listed on the evaluation (see Appendix A).

QUESTION ONE: What criteria were judged to be most and least adequate by cooperating teachers?

Findings

Examination of Table 1 shows that Fredonia students were generally graded higher with regard to personal traits than they were on instructional traits. In addition, analysis of written statements indicated that supervisors were more concerned with personal traits than instructional traits.

Discussion

If personality is what is being looked at most closely, then what the students are really doing very well is adjusting

to their situation. Rating on the basis of personality can be expected to continue if the evaluator's own weighting system for the criteria is used. What seems to be an immediate task is to specify exactly what SUC, Fredonia, views as important to evaluate.

At SUC, Fredonia, Elementary Education majors take 18 hours of professional education courses prior to student teaching. It is assumed that passing these courses provides the students with the necessary instructional background for them to be able to successfully practice teach in an actual classroom. With the emphasis in professional education courses on instructional traits, it must be asked why the expected instructional proficiencies were not achieved. Three reasons are offered: (a) personal traits may be viewed as immediately important by the evaluating teacher, and instructional traits may be expected to develop with time, (b) instructional traits were not transferred to the practicing situation, and/or (c) cooperating teachers may feel less confident in commenting critically on instructional traits than personal traits.

QUESTION TWO: Do the criteria predict success ("success" was defined in terms of grades, recommendations, and finding a job)?

Findings

A. Grades. Table 2 shows that the criteria did predict final grades in student teaching. The correlation coefficient for the criteria is appreciable but none are high enough to account for more than one-fourth of the variance.

B. Recommendations. Table 3 shows that the criteria did predict the recommendation from the college supervisor. The correlation coefficient for each criteria is appreciable but none are high enough to account for more than one-fourth of the variance.

C. Job Success. Table 4 shows that the criteria were not associated with the student finding a job.

Discussion

The first measure of success was grade. The final grade was submitted by the supervisor. Its determination was usually a result of the cooperating teacher's day-to-day observation of the student as it appears on the evaluation sheet. Because of the nature of student teaching, there has developed an unwritten guideline that if the student shows any promise as a teacher he should receive either an "A" or "B" as a final grade unless "Pass-Fail" is selected by the student.

The findings suggested that the weighting of the individual criterion is again a factor to be considered. The highest degrees of association tend to be between criteria concerned with the cooperating teacher's view of the student teacher's impersonal relationship to work with objects in the room, as seen in the ratings of physical environment

and initiative. Lower associations between grade and the individual criteria of professionalism, self evaluation, and communication, are indicators of a student's ability to work with people and also to evaluate her own performance. It is concluded that grading tends to be more highly associated with willingness to work at classroom tasks rather than with working with professional staff and children.

The second measure of success was a written supervisory recommendation of the student teacher. The recommendation was submitted to the Placement Office by the supervisor and was included in the student's placement folder. The outline of the letter of recommendation asked for estimates of the student teacher's ability in planning, presentation of lessons, personal qualities, and potential as a teacher.

The cooperating teacher and the supervisor may have been looking at different things as being most important in student teaching success. The supervisor seemed constrained to talk about the student's potential while the cooperating teacher's comments were directed to the immediate actions of the student teacher. The cooperating teacher was asked to grade the student on his act.. performance and the supervisor was asked to extrapolate the actual performance to probable performance in other situations. It seems that the supervisors

realized that student teaching is less a matter of demonstrating instructional skill and more a matter of a personal adjustment to the specific situation.

QUESTION THREE: What is the relationship between the criteria and placement (obtaining a job within the school system in which the student practice taught)?

Findings

Table 5 shows that there was no relationship between criteria and obtaining a job within the school system in which the student practice taught (Placement).

Discussion

Undoubtedly the most cogent finding was that none of the criteria account for much of the variance. The only criteria with some specific association was grooming and attire which accounts for only four percent of the variance.

With these results, a question may be asked: If the evaluative criteria are not associated with placement, what criteria are? Or, stated otherwise - by what criteria are student teachers hired?

QUESTION FOUR: Is there any relationship between grades and recommendations and obtaining teaching jobs?

Findings

Table 6 indicates that neither grades nor recommendations by supervisors were related to obtaining jobs.

Discussion

These data indicate that college supervisors were spending much time and energy on an enterprise which had little payoff in helping students obtain jobs. Possibly recommendations by cooperating teachers are seen as more important by hiring officials.

It is also apparent that the tremendous anxieties of students and faculty over grades has nothing to do with obtaining a job. The pass-fail option does seem to be a step in the right direction since irrelevant data just complicate an already confused picture of what are the important criteria for hiring a teacher.

QUESTION FIVE: Is the particular approach (traditional, building or team-teaching) in which the student teacher practiced related to grades, jobs and supervisor recommendations?

Findings

Table 6 shows that the choice of student teaching approach has little relationship to any of the criteria of "success" as a student teacher.

Discussion

There has been considerable discussion among faculty that the approach under which a student teacher practice teaches may determine his success as a student teacher. Some staff members say that those students trained in "the new ideas" may be more successful in gaining employment.

Possibly the finding that grades and recommendations are relatively unrelated to approach has something to do with supervisory patterns at SUC, Fredonia. If the supervisor accepts the philosophy of the school in which he is supervising, then his grades and recommendations would be expected to reflect the values of that system. Adjustment to the philosophy by the student teachers may result in good grades and recommendations.

One is again brought to the question of what are the criteria that differentiates if these "traditional" criteria do not?

Conclusions and Implications

In the beginning of the study the validity of the Student Teaching Evaluation Form was questioned. This study provides considerable evidence that the Form has little validity - either internally or externally.

Internally, none of the fifteen specific criteria has power to differentiate between student teaching behaviors. Even though there are performance standards for each criterion, the findings indicated that the scale does not differentiate among students. An interpretation for this lack of differentiation is that the criteria are labelled Poor, Average, and Outstanding; thus, teachers responsible for evaluating students may be ignoring the stated performance standards and may be substituting their own interpretations for each label.

Personal traits of Fredonia student teachers are marked higher than instructional traits. The expectation according to professional education course summaries is that students will acquire certain knowledges and skills of teaching. There is no explicit statement about personal adjustment to the public school situations. The finding that traits not explicitly taught are rated highest (while those taught are rated lowest) raises some fundamental questions about (methods) teaching strategies.

Externally, the scale has little relationship with any of the "success" criteria (grades, written recommendations and obtaining a job) of student teaching. Knowing a person's rating on the fifteen criteria has no relationship to predicting job placement. Since there is no relationship, one concludes that some other criteria are used to decide hiring of student teachers. The investigators do not know what they are, but since prospective employers are not using these scaled criteria, student teachers are being hired on the basis of other information. Clearly, too much time and effort is presently consumed in writing recommendations and filling out evaluation forms.

The major implication of this study is that some scales or methods which will differentiate between teaching skills are needed. If this is not accepted as a goal then SUC, Fredonia, will continue to produce student teachers whose greatest "teaching skill" is the ability to "adapt" to different personalities - that is, assessing

what the teacher or administrator wants and providing him with it. The choice is clear: continue the same pattern with the same questionable "knowledge and procedures" (and assumptions) or create a new situation based upon observable teaching skills with agreed upon, specified performance criteria.

It would appear that the SUC, Fredonia staff has a task to determine what teaching skills are of prime importance to teaching. Only then can strategies be developed which will achieve the teaching skills identified.

Bibliography

Elam, Stanley, "Performance-based Teacher Education," AACTE Bulletin, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, Number 9, (Washington, D. C. 20036, December, 1971), p. 6.

Bouchard, John B., and Hull, Ronald E. Problems and Practices in the Induction of Beginning Teachers, Teacher Education Research Center Report, (SUC, Fredonia, New York, 1970).

APPENDIX A

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT FREDONIA, NEW YORK 14063

Evaluation of Student Teaching of _____
(Student's Name)

School _____ Grade Level _____

Dates: From _____, 19____ to _____, 19____

Attendance: Days Absent _____

_____ _____
Cooperating Teacher *College Supervisor*

STUDENT TEACHING PROFILE

		Rating		
		Poor	*Average*	*Outstanding*
Instructional Traits	- Objectives - p. 2			
	Planning - p. 2			
	Communication - p. 2			
	Teaching Practices - p. 2			
	Carrying On Discussions - p. 3			
	Evaluation - p. 3			
Human Relationships	- With Pupils - p. 3			
Classroom Management	- Physical Environment - p. 3			
	Emotional Environment - p. 4			
Personal Traits	- Initiative - p. 4			
	Professionalism - p. 4			
	Grooming and Attire - p. 4			
	Scholastic Background - p. 4			
	Health and Vitality - p. 4			
	Self-Evaluation Ability - p. 4			

DIRECTIONS: Mark the chart on the appropriate continuum line and connect each mark with a line to complete the profile. Do this at least twice during the experience using different colors of ink. You may makr each category in the Evaluation Form and then transfer it to the chart or work directlv with the chart if the standards under each heading are clearly understood.

* SUMMARY OF REMARKS *

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT FREDONIA, NEW YORK 14063

Student's Name _____ Revised Evaluation Form 1968

INSTRUCTIONAL TRAITS

Objectives

[illegible] of teaching [illegible] stated objectives. [illegible] objectives too vague and [illegible] to meaningful

Has stated objectives, but they are too vague and general to be used to evaluate pupil's learning. Not stated in behavioral terms.

States meaningful objectives in behavioral terms with sufficient clarity and specifity to give direction to teaching and evaluate pupil's learning

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

Planning

[illegible] lesson planning [illegible] teaching. Does not see any need for planning. Lesson plans are not sufficient detail to be [illegible] to teaching. Lacks ability in long term planning [illegible]

Makes lesson plans of a rather mechanical nature, usually using the teacher manual as a guide. Generally the plans are not directly related to pupil needs, nor to the stated objectives.

Does both long and short range planning, frequently involves pupils in the plans, and takes into consideration the stated objectives, the abilities and needs of the pupils, the nature of the subject matter, and the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher. Understands the role of planning in instruction, and has the confidence to deviate from the plans when conditions warrant. Plans are complete, detailed, and a real help for teaching.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

Communication

Cannot communicate effectively due to one or more of the following: Speaks too softly, speaks too rapidly, speaks in a monotonous or otherwise unpleasant manner, uses too mature a vocabulary, or employs sentences which are unrelated and confusing. Lacks skill in effective written communications, e.g., correct spelling and grammar. Cannot give meaningful directions to children.

Voice is usually clear, pleasant, and effective in tone quality. Gives directions and explanations which pupils can generally follow. Spells needed word correctly and uses proper grammatical forms in written communications.

Voice is always clear and pleasant. Very effective in giving clear and interesting presentations. Skillful in written communications.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

Teaching Practices

Activities allowed to drag; slow and confusing transition from one activity to another. Experiences lack logical organization, show almost no creativity or ingenuity. Fails to allow time and effort in working with individuals and small groups on specific problems. Fails to deviate from planned lesson when necessary.

Offers positive suggestions to learners who have difficulties. Gives all learners an opportunity to participate in group discussions and class projects. Treats children courteously. Prepares appropriate visual aids. Corrects all assignments and discusses them with learners.

Provides for balance between physical and sedentary classroom activities. Arranges a realistic time schedule and adheres to it without being inflexible. Prepares questions in a discussion that stimulate the learners' involvement and thinking.

Poor Average Outstanding

Remarks _____

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Carrying On Discussions

[illegible] stimulate pupils' thinking. Questions poorly constructed. [illegible] does most of the talking. [illegible] ignores experiential background of children.

Questions requiring recall of facts and details mainly used. Pupils fairly responsive but answers to questions reveal little critical thinking. Teacher controls the direction of the discussion so it flows pupil-to-teacher, teacher-to-pupil, never pupil-to-pupil. Teacher tries to consider experiential background of children.

Uses thought-provoking open-ended questions. Arouses and holds pupil interest. Able to involve pupils in the discussion without being the focal point.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

Evaluation

[illegible] range of individual differences in the class. Children have opportunity to evaluate conduct and achievement. Evaluation not used in planning future learning experiences.

Assesses abilities of learner and mastery of their basic skills. Uses various methods of evaluation: rating scales, check list, observation. Reports in terms consistent with criteria established by school. Applies the results of evaluation in planning appropriate learning experiences.

Makes continuous studies of needs of individual learners. Helps children diagnose their own learning needs. Evaluates in terms of observable objectives. Evaluates learners' thinking processes; observation, classification, analysis, comparison. Plans to have children discover relationships when possible.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

With Pupils

Too informal or formal with pupils. Shows little understanding of pupils' feelings, attitudes, strengths, and needs. Disregards social forces at work in the classroom. Overlooks opportunities to challenge pupils in a positive manner.

Is usually poised, confident, and relates positively to pupils. Attentive to individual differences of pupils. Shows an understanding of group dynamics in working with classes.

Has poise and self-confidence when encountering teaching difficulties. Shows understanding of the range and differences in individual development, ability, attitude, feelings, and needs of the children. Gains group confidence and builds mutual respect.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Physical Environment

Appears to be unaware of appropriate physical conditions. Maintains an indifference to housekeeping details. [illegible] attention is given to bulletin boards.

Conscious of lighting, ventilation, and temperature control. Gives attention to a neat and attractive classroom. Bulletin boards are generally well planned and satisfying to pupils. Encourages children to take responsibility in housekeeping chores.

Encourages pupils to cooperate in maintaining maximum comfort and conditions conducive to optimum learning. Maintains a pleasant and attractive classroom. Provides opportunities for creative bulletin boards with the children.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks _____

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Emotional Environment

Unaware of emotional needs of pupils. Pupil behavior expresses conflict and hostility. Lacks respect of children and classroom control.

Has insight into the causes of control problems in the class. Shows concern for children. Attempts to create positive classroom atmosphere.

Gives attention to the causes of pupil behavior for possible solution. Encourages pupils to discuss their concerns with the teacher.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

PERSONAL TRAITS

Initiative

Dependent on cooperating teacher for ideas and decisions. Lacks self-confidence. Insensitive to responsibilities of teacher and the classroom.

Begins to make independent decisions and initiates activities. Participates willingly in activities. Shows an interest in assuming responsibility.

Shows originality and independence in planning lessons and teaching. Seeks suggestions and opportunities to assume responsibility. Very sensitive to classroom responsibilities.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

Professionalism

Complains frequently about required tasks. Talks indiscreetly about pupils, other staff members, and parents. Often violates Code of Ethics.

Follows Code of Ethics. Talks discreetly about pupils, other staff members, and parents. Attends professional meetings willingly.

Works well with other staff members. Attends and participates in professional meetings. Demonstrates strong interest in professional growth.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

Grooming and Attire

Clothes unpressed. Hair unkempt. Make-up and style of clothes inappropriate for the classroom. Lacks body cleanliness.

Usually clothes well kept and appropriate for the classroom. Careful about cleanliness of nails, hair and body.

Always well groomed. Wears clothes appropriate for the occasion.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

Scholastic Background

Indicates limited background in curricular areas taught.

Shows adequate ability and achievement in subject matter to be taught.

Reveals a thorough, rich, varied background in areas taught.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

Health and Vitality

Lethargic. Little physical drive or energy. Absences due to illness.

Appears to have good general health and energy.

Very energetic. Excellent health evident.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

Self-Evaluation Ability

Unaware of weaknesses. Satisfied with situation as it is. Retreats from reality when analyzing self.

Usually judges own achievement correctly and avoids repeating mistakes.

Evaluates worth realistically. Applies own high standards in locating and correcting weaknesses.

Poor *Average* *Outstanding*

Remarks

APPENDIX B

TABLE 1

Criteria Rank Ordered by Percent Having an Outstanding Rating on That Criteria*

Criteria	Rating on Specific Criteria		
	Outstanding	Average	Poor
	%	%	%
Grooming and Attire	82	18	0
Professionalism	73	26	1
Human Relationships	69	31	0
Initiative	68	31	1
Emotional Environment	67	32	1
Self Evaluation	67	30.5	2.5
Health and Vitality	65	34	1
Planning	63	36	1
Objectives	62	38	0
Physical Environment	60	39	1
Scholastic Background	60	38.5	1.5
Evaluation of Pupils	58	41	1
Discussion	57	42	1
Teaching Practices	56	43	1
Communication	52	48	0

*N - 130

TABLE 2

Criteria Rank Ordered By Correlation* With Grade

Criteria	Correlation
Physical Environment	.43
Initiative	.43
Scholastic Background	.40
Health and Vitality	.38
Planning	.37
Human Relationships with Pupils	.33
Grooming and Attire	.33
Evaluation of Pupils	.33
Teaching Practices	.32
Emotional Environment	.32
Objectives	.31
Discussions	.30
Communication	.28
Self Evaluation	.28
Professionalism	.25

*N = 130

TABLE 3

Criteria Rank Ordered by Correlation*
With Recommendation

Criteria	Correlation
Professionalism	.48
Human Relationships with Pupils	.45
Self Evaluation	.45
Emotional Environment	.44
Communication	.43
Objectives	.42
Health and Vitality	.41
Evaluation of Pupils	.39
Initiative	.39
Physical Environment	.39
Planning	.38
Discussion	.37
Teaching Practices	.36
Grooming and Attire	.36
Scholastic Background	.35

*N = 130

TABLE 4

Criteria Rank Ordered by Correlation*

With Success in Obtaining a Job

Criteria	Correlation
Professionalism	.20
Grooming and Attire	.03
Physical Environment	.05
Teaching Practices	.05
Communication	.06
Scholastic Background	.08
Human Relationships with Pupils	.10
Initiative	.11
Planning	.12
Emotional Environment	.12
Self Evaluation	.12
Objectives	.12
Evaluation of Pupils	.15
Discussions	.19
Health and Vitality	-.01

*N = 130

TABLE 5

Criteria Rank Ordered by Correlation*
With Placement

Rank	Correlation
Grooming and Attire	.21
Human Relationships with Pupils	.12
Physical Environment	.12
Discussion	.07
Health and Vitality	.05
Objectives	.04
Planning	.00
Professionalism	.00
Emotional Environment	-.01
Self-Evaluation	-.01
Student Evaluation	.02
Teaching Practices	.03
Scholastic Background	-.03
Initiative	-.06
Communication	-.09

*N = 130

TABLE 6

Correlation* Between Approach And
Student Teaching Success

	Grades	Jobs	Placement	Recommendations
Approach	.15	-.05	.10	-.04
Recommendations	.34	-.09	.07	
Placement	.02	-.09		
Jobs	.02			

*N = 130

TABLE 7

Matrix of Correlations* Between
Criteria and Indicators
of Success

Criteria	Job	Grade	Written Recommendation	Placement
Objectives	-.12	.31	.42	.04
Planning	-.12	.37	.38	.00
Communication	-.06	.28	.43	.09
Teaching Practices	-.05	.32	.36	.03
Discussions	-.19	.30	.37	.07
Evaluation of Pupils	-.15	.33	.39	.02
Human Relationships with Pupils	-.10	.33	.45	.12
Physical Environment	-.05	.43	.38	.12
Emotional Environment	-.12	.32	.44	.01
Initiative	-.11	.43	.39	.06
Professionalism	-.20	.25	.48	.00
Grooming and Attire	-.03	.33	.36	.21
Scholastic Background	-.08	.40	.35	.03
Health and Vitality	-.01	.38	.41	.05
Self Evaluation	-.12	.28	.45	.01

*N = 130

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX C

PLACEMENT BUREAU - STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE - FREDONIA, NEW YORK 14063

To the College Supervisor:

Please type your Student Teaching letter of recommendation below for:

_____

As a guide for your recommendation or appraisal, it is suggested that you include statements concerning the capacity in which you have known the student, the length of time you have known him, his academic ability, his ability to plan, organize and present lessons, his personal qualities, and your general evaluation of him and his potential.

Your prompt attention to this request will be appreciated by the College Placement Bureau and by the student. When typed (and we must insist on typing because of the photo-copying involved), please return to the Director of Placement at the above address.

TO BE SUBMITTED NO LATER THAN 5 DAYS AFTER COMPLETION OF STUDENT TEACHING

PLEASE DO NOT TYPE ON BACK - USE SECOND SHEET IF NECESSARY

Recommended by: _____
[Printed name and Signature]

Position: _____ Date: _____